

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/938,937	YAKHINI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634

All Participants:

Status of Application: 71

(1) Bradley L. Sisson.

(3) _____.

(2) Cynthia J. Lee, Reg. No. 46,033.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 May 2005

Time: 1550

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Sisson indicated that a Notice of Non-compliant Amendment would be sent as the amendment to the specification was not of an acceptable format, i.e., lines were single spaced as compared to being 1.5 or double spaced, as was done for the amendment to the claims.

Mr. Sisson noted that the substance of the amendment to the specification may well raise issues of new matter, as the insertion of language stipulating that document(s) are now incorporated "in its entirety" or "in their entirety" was not adequately supported by the disclosure.

Mr. Sisson also noted that while the trademark TRITON X-100 had been capitalized, the generic terminology sought was the actual chemical formulation, not the general property of the product. Mr. Sisson noted that catalogues such as Fluka have been known to provide such generic terminology. .